

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON
JANUARY 13, 1989, IN LISNER HALL
ROOM 603

The meeting was called to order by President Trachtenberg at 2:16 p.m.

Present: President Trachtenberg, Vice President French, Registrar Gaglione, Parliamentarian Schechter, Berkovich, Birnbaum, Burdetsky, Burks, Chaves, Cibinic, Cohn, Deering, East, Elgart, Fox, Friedenthal, Garriss, Griffith, Grub, Kenny, Kirsch, Leonard, Morgan, Painter, Paratore, Park, Parrish, Robinson, Schiff, Smith, Solomon, Tolchin, Yezer

Absent: Divita, Liebowitz, Moore, Prats

At this point, a brief recess was called in order for a group photograph to be taken of the Faculty Senate (1988-89 Session). After the photo-session was completed, the Senate proceeded to Item 3.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of November 11, 1988, were approved as distributed.

RESOLUTIONS

I. RESOLUTION 88/3, "A RESOLUTION CONCERNING FACULTY SUPPORT OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES"

On behalf of the Libraries Committee, Professor Deering, Chairman, introduced and distributed a Substitute Resolution for Resolution 88/3, "A Resolution Concerning Faculty Support of University Libraries." Professor Deering explained that the substitute resolution was a revision by the Libraries Committee of Resolution 88/3 in response to suggestions by the Executive Committee. The substitute resolution provided elaboration on the resolving clause in the original resolution by adding two more which would request the Development Office to circulate the resolution to the faculty and would request the Administration to agree to match dollar-for-dollar those funds generated by this resolution. Professor Deering then asked unanimous consent to defer Resolution 88/3 on the agenda in order to take up the Substitute Resolution 88/3 instead. No objections were made. He then moved adoption of Substitute Resolution 88/3, and the motion was seconded.

Professor Cibinic moved that the third resolving clause be amended by substituting the word "requests" for the word "supports"

in the first line and by deleting the word "Administration" in the second line. The motion was seconded. Professor Deering accepted the amendment. A discussion followed by Professors Yezer, Deering, Grub, and President Trachtenberg. Professor Morgan said that he thought it entirely appropriate for the Senate to advise the faculty on its view regarding an additional contribution from the faculty to support the Libraries, but he did not think that it was advisable to indicate that the faculty's contributions to any particular University activity were to be guided and directed by the availability of funds from the University. He then moved that the third resolving clause be deleted in its entirety. Professor Fox said that he thought the intent of the third resolving clause was to entice those faculty to make a contribution who otherwise might not unless they saw that the University was also contributing to the extent that it could. Because it was not clear that the Administration had agreed to do the matching of funds which would be required to make it a valid enticement, Professor Cibinic spoke in support of the Morgan amendment. Professor Park said that he thought the resolution expressed the Senate's own priority and concern about the Library as a central aspect of the University. He noted that the Gelman Library, as opposed to the professional school libraries, was shared and therefore was not immunized in any way against across-the-board cuts. Professor Park said that he opposed deletion of the third resolving clause because it seemed to him that it was simply requesting the Administration to give very special weight to the needs of the Library. Professor Grub spoke in favor of the amendment because he thought it was wrong to ask the University to support the Library on this basis, and he reminded the Senate that it had passed Resolution 87/11 last spring requesting restoration of funds to the Library which was specific to the budget issue; the resolution before the Senate, he said, was separate and apart from Resolution 87/11. The question was called and the Morgan amendment to delete the third resolving clause was adopted by a vote of 11-9.

Professor Griffith asked whether there had been any response by the Administration to Resolution 87/11 which asked that funds be restored to the Gelman Library. Professor Deering replied that as far as he knew action on Resolution 87/11 was still pending. Professor Griffith emphasized the urgency of restoring funds to the Library both on the acquisitions side and on the operations side because it appeared to him that the system was breaking down and additional funds were needed to try to sustain operation of the Library at a higher level. Professor Cibinic then moved the following amendment: "That the Senate requests that the University show its support for the Libraries by increasing the budget of the Libraries by an amount equal to one percent of the aggregate budgets of the three University Libraries." The motion was seconded. Professors Schiff, Deering, and Yezer spoke against the amendment. The President said that he wished to assure the Senate that he would do everything he could to support the Library. Professor Tolchin said that the Gelman Library might be protected in the same way that the professional school libraries have been protected in the past.

She recommended that the Libraries Committee might wish to consider that idea, and, perhaps, even bring it to the Budget Committee with a view toward preventing a crisis like this in the future. The question was called on the Cibinic amendment, and the amendment was defeated. The question was then called on the original motion, as amended, and Substitute Resolution 88/3, as amended, was adopted. (Substitute Resolution 88/3, as amended, is attached.)

II. RESOLUTION 88/4, "A RESOLUTION CONCERNING SABBATICAL LEAVE POLICY"

On behalf of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, Professor Robinson, Chairman, moved the adoption of Resolution 88/4, "A Resolution Concerning Sabbatical Leave Policy," and the motion was seconded. Professor Robinson stated that the purpose of the resolution was to encourage and facilitate faculty research productivity and that the incentive of an additional 10% to the yearly salary would hopefully encourage that kind of research. She said that the Executive Committee had consulted with the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee on this resolution and that that Committee had no objection to it. Professor Robinson noted that the idea for this resolution came from President Trachtenberg and she thanked the President on behalf of the Executive Committee.

Professor Elgart expressed his reservations about the resolution because much of the salary support in the Medical School comes from the clinical practice. As Chairman of a small department which has three active members, Professor Elgart said that if one of those members wished to go on sabbatical, that would cut income by a third, but not expenses by a third, and the bottom line would be such that there would not be sufficient funds left for bonuses. Because of this, it was already difficult for members of Clinical Departments to get sabbaticals. He said if one then increased support -- and, therefore, departmental costs -- to 60% instead of 50%, it would be more difficult rather than less difficult for clinical faculty to have any chance of receiving sabbatical leaves.

Professor Cibinic expressed his concern about the source of additional moneys to pay for the cost of the 10% increase since there didn't appear to be any additional moneys to support the Library. Professor Morgan commented that it was less expensive for a department if a faculty member took a whole year's sabbatical than a half year's, and Professor Smith agreed. Dean Friedenthal said that he supported the resolution but disagreed that it would be less costly if a faculty member took a whole year's sabbatical unless one wanted to compromise quality. In the Law Center, he said, faculty of equal or greater quality would be brought in to teach those classes and that that would cost money. Further discussion followed by Professors Robinson, Cibinic, and President Trachtenberg. Professors Grub, Yezer, and Tolchin spoke in favor of the resolution. The question was called and Resolution 88/4 was adopted. (Resolution 88/4 is attached.)

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions were introduced.

FINAL REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION OF SPIA;
PROFESSOR RAYMOND R. FOX, CHAIRMAN

Professor Fox said that the members of the Special Committee had worked very hard to prepare this Report for the Senate and he wished to publicly thank the members of the Committee -- Professors Robert S. Goldfarb, William R. Johnson, John A. Morgan, Jr., and Ralph G. Steinhardt -- for their good efforts. Professor Fox explained that the Report sets forth several specific issues identified by the Special Committee in responses received from a number of administrators and faculty members to questions addressing the consolidation of SPIA. He suggested that since it was a very lengthy report that perhaps the Executive Committee might direct that some of the issues be considered by various Senate Standing Committees and be brought back to the Senate for discussion. Professor Fox also asked that the Special Committee be dissolved since it had completed its charge.

Professor Robinson replied that the Executive Committee would review the Report with a view towards submitting it to appropriate Senate Committees for consideration of the various issues.

GENERAL BUSINESS

I. NOMINATION FOR ELECTION OF PROFESSOR MARVIN S. KATZMAN AS ACTING
CO-CHAIRPERSON OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF FACULTY AND STUDENTS

On behalf of the Executive Committee, Professor Robinson nominated Professor Marvin S. Katzman as Acting Co-Chairperson of the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students. No nominations were made from the floor, and Professor Katzman was unanimously elected.

II. NOMINATION FOR ELECTION OF PROFESSOR ROBERT N. GANZ TO THE JOINT
COMMITTEE OF FACULTY AND STUDENTS

On behalf of the Executive Committee, Professor Robinson nominated Professor Robert N. Ganz to the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students as replacement for Professor Robbins who was on sabbatical leave Spring 1989. No nominations were made from the floor and Professor Ganz was unanimously elected.

III. NOMINATION FOR ELECTION OF PROFESSOR GEORGIO V. BORGIOTTI TO
THE HONORS AND ACADEMIC CONVOCATIONS COMMITTEE

On behalf of the Executive Committee, Professor Robinson nominated Professor Georgio V. Borgiotti for election to the Honors and Academic Convocations Committee. No nominations were made from the floor, and Professor Borgiotti was unanimously elected.

IV. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Robinson, on behalf of the Executive Committee, reported on the activities of the Committee. (The report is attached and made a part of these minutes.)

BRIEF STATEMENTS

Professor Kirsch, Chairman of the Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies Committee, said that the Committee had been concerned for some time about the health and medical benefits of the University specifically relating to retirees. Since there appeared at this point no forthcoming University-wide publication on the newest current policies, Professor Kirsch said that his Committee has requested that the latest statement as to health and insurance benefits available to retirees be included for distribution to the faculty with the minutes of this meeting.

Professor Tolchin said that she was happy to announce that a member of the Senate, Professor Lilien F. Robinson, Chairman of the Executive Committee, had just had a book published by the Corcoran Collection about the French sculptor Antoine Louis Barye, and she congratulated Professor Robinson.

Professor Deering, with reference to the discussion earlier of support of the Libraries, said he wished at this time to note that the Libraries Committee had received a personal check from President Trachtenberg with a note indicating that the check was intended to symbolize his commitment to the Committee's solicitation of faculty colleagues for their voluntary contributions to the support of the University's Libraries, and hoped that this initiative would make the Committee's enterprise more plausible.

Professor Griffith invited a brief statement from the President. Noting that the President had now been on the job for six months, he asked him if he would have anything at this time to tell the Senate about what he saw as priorities for his action and attention. President Trachtenberg replied that he would be happy to address himself to that at the forthcoming January 24, 1989, Faculty Assembly and, if necessary, again at the February 10th meeting of the Senate. However, the President said that he did have a statement to make at this time about some good news. Recently he attended a retirement dinner in Philadelphia for Mr. L. Stanley Crane, a member of the University's Board of Trustees. Mr. Trachtenberg said that he was pleased to tell the Senate that he came back with two checks totalling \$1,010,000 to establish a Chair in Mr. Crane's honor in the School of Engineering and Applied Science. The President commented that he thought that that was a nice way to start the new year. The Senate indicated its appreciation by applause.

Professor Robinson announced that the next meeting of the Executive Committee was January 27th, and asked that resolutions be submitted to the Committee by that date.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion made and seconded, President Trachtenberg adjourned the meeting at 3:30 p.m.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "J. Matthew Gaglione". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name and title.

J. Matthew Gaglione
Secretary

SUBSTITUTE RESOLUTION

A Resolution Concerning Faculty Support of University Libraries (88/3)

WHEREAS, libraries are an essential resource for the quality of education at George Washington University; and

WHEREAS, faculty members from the several schools in the University are among the principal beneficiaries of strong University libraries; and

WHEREAS, budget cuts, combined with skyrocketing publishing costs, have forced the University's libraries to make significant, even ruinous cuts in acquisitions during the past two years;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY:

1) That the Senate urges all members of the faculty of The George Washington University to make a special contribution to the Annual Fund this year--either an additional pledge or a portion of a new pledge--and to designate it for "acquisitions" by one or all of the University's libraries; and

2) That, upon adoption of this resolution, the Senate desires an effort by the Development Office to ensure appropriate distribution of this resolution to members of the University Faculty; and,

~~(3) That the Senate supports requests matching by the University Administration of all funds generated by this effort on a dollar-for-dollar basis and with a ceiling equal to one percent of the aggregate budgets of the three University libraries.~~

Libraries Committee
January 13, 1989

Adopted, as amended, January 13, 1989

A RESOLUTION CONCERNING SABBATICAL LEAVE POLICY (88/4)

WHEREAS, a major goal of the University has been to improve and increase research productivity; and

WHEREAS, the attainment of that goal has been severely limited by inadequate resources and release time; and

WHEREAS, sabbatical leave represents an appropriate vehicle for encouragement of research activity; and

WHEREAS, financial constraints have prevented faculty from selecting the full year sabbatical leave option; and

WHEREAS, the Administration has indicated its support of greater utilization of that option by its willingness to increase the University's contribution from 50% to 60% for the full year sabbatical leave; NOW, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That, effective for sabbatical leaves in 1989-90 and thereafter, faculty will be able to select a two-semester leave term with a payment of 60% of their salary; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED

That Section VI.B., Paragraph 4, lines 1-3 (p.13) of the Faculty Code be changed to read:

"The University shall pay members of the Faculty while on sabbatical leave 60% of their salary for two semesters or all of their salary for one semester.

(addition indicated by underlining)

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
December 16, 1988

Adopted January 13, 1989



THE
GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

School of Engineering and Applied Science / Washington, D.C. 20052

*Department of Civil, Mechanical,
and Environmental Engineering
(202) 994-6149*

January 5, 1989

TO: Members, Faculty Senate

FROM: Senate Special Committee on Consolidation of the School
 of Public and International Affairs

SUBJECT: Final Report of the Committee

The Committee has met a number of times. It has received written responses from a number of administrators and faculty members to questions addressing the consolidation of SPIA.

The Committee has identified several specific issues which it considers appropriate for Senate consideration. These are spelled out below in a rough order of importance. The Committee made no effort to resolve these issues, viewing its mandate instead as one of identifying and articulating the most relevant questions for debate. Inevitably perhaps, the Committee discovered that these concrete issues tended to escalate into more basic questions of academic self-image and priorities.

In particular, two fundamental questions seemed to recur.

The first was one of procedure: What role should the faculty play in reorganization decisions of this sort? What mechanisms should we have for identifying and hearing those members of the faculty who are affected by this and similar decisions? Plainly, the adequacy of faculty consultation in this case lies in the eye of the beholder. But the Committee hopes that the controversy will allow us as a community to define more precisely what procedures are to be expected in similar cases. At a time when we welcome a new administration, that kind of clarity seems critical.

The second and related question was more substantive: How autonomous should each school in the University be? The essential problems that have arisen in the first year of operation under the new ESIA regime are -- predictably -- matters of hiring, promotion, and compensation in departments of disciplines split between schools. The Committee considered the organizational models at other universities which have faced similar difficulties, and discovered a range of models from complete autonomy (where departments within schools enjoyed complete independence even from related or identical departments in other schools) to University centralization (where such decisions were made largely, if not entirely on the basis of University needs). The Committee believes that a thorough consideration of the ESIA reorganization will

require the Senate to reflect on where in this spectrum we wish -- and can afford -- to be.

The major issues, a total of nine, are presented below for your consideration and discussion.

1. What size the faculty budgeted to ESIA is to be, and how that decision will be and/or should be made?

1.1 A core faculty budgeted to ESIA may well offer some advantages with regard to primary loyalty to the School and its programs although it should be noted that in the past some of the most diligent (and loyal) advisors and program directors were not budgeted to the School.

1.2 Faculty members who are budgeted to ESIA and are at the same time appropriately members of a disciplinary department in another school (e.g., Political Science, Economics, History) may find that membership problematic precisely because their primary loyalty will lie with the school to which they are budgeted. This could be particularly troublesome when the area of teaching and research responsibility (e.g., International Politics or Comparative Politics) is of fundamental importance to both the disciplinary department and to ESIA (see also issue No. 3).

1.3 Thus, the size of the faculty budgeted to ESIA must be considered in terms of the problems suggested by issues No. 3, 6, and 7 below and their relation to long-range programmatic goals of the University.

1.4 The process of determining the appropriate size of the School's core faculty was based on several factors. First, there was a need to provide for sufficient faculty to direct the School's academic programs. Second, there was the need to provide the School with a core of faculty to provide academic leadership, including advising, attending ceremonial functions, and supporting and organizing program activities. Third, a comparative analysis of other schools of international affairs indicated that the proposed size of the core faculty was in the appropriate range.

It is entirely possible that in the future a more systematic comparative analysis across programs here at GW (such as may emerge from a coordinated planning process) would justify a larger core faculty for the School than that currently proposed.

2. Serious concern has been voiced regarding the adequacy of faculty consultation with respect to the reconstitution of SPIA.

2.1 The administration believes there has been adequate consultation with the faculty on this matter.

2.2 Many faculty feel that the administration has not honored either the spirit or even the letter of the requirement for consultation on such a reconstitution of ESIA.

2.3 Some members of the Committee believe that careful consideration of the record of what the Vice President for Academic Affairs said about the reconstitution, the dates on which those statements were made, and the schedule of events relating to the reconstitution makes unmistakably clear the inadequacy of faculty consultation.

2.4 If consultation has been inadequate, what steps can the Senate take to help ensure adequate consultation on newly emerging issues of comparable significance?

3. What difficulties for faculty recruitment and governance are associated with the complicated nature of faculty appointments to ESIA, and how can these difficulties be ameliorated?

The committee has identified four categories of issues under this heading: (1) recruitment and appointments; (2) comparability of salary treatment across schools; (3) differing school affiliations within a department leading to dissention and divisive splits within the department; and (4) definition of appropriate responsibilities for faculty with memberships in more than one school.

3.1 Recruitment and appointments.

(a) Under the present ESIA bylaws, the disciplinary department to which an individual would be appointed can veto that appointment.

(b) There is the possibility of legitimate conflicts between disciplinary departments and the school because departments and the school may well have different priorities for appointments.

- At the most concrete level, the history department (for example) might view appointing a European historian as its top priority, while the school's top priority might be obtaining a Latin American historian.

- At a less specific level, a department and the school might have profoundly different views of what constitutes the appropriate disciplinary focus an appointee ought to exhibit. The department's view of the kind of appointment that enhances its reputation within the discipline may be at odds with the school's perceived need for individuals with interdisciplinary regional specializations.

(c) These tensions are likely to be exacerbated when the

appointment is at a senior level, since such appointments have more effect on the image of a department, and involve a larger redistribution of power within the department.

(d) There has already been some experience with new appointments budgeted to ESIA.

- In two cases of recruiting for junior appointments in Economics and in History, the process of consultation between department and school seemed to work smoothly, and did not appear to generate any notable difficulties.

- In the case of a senior appointment to head the Sino-Soviet Institute, the problem (described above) arose because the department and school had profoundly different views of what constitutes the appropriate disciplinary focus an appointee ought to exhibit. The problem was magnified by the fact that the position involved administrative and fund-raising responsibilities, qualities important to the school but not part of the department's criteria for a senior tenured appointment. This case resulted in a change in the bylaws allowing for this administrative position only appointment with tenure in the school (and not in a department). Note that the impasse that generated this particular solution may not arise in cases where special administrative skills are not needed.

- In the case of two other senior appointments in Soviet Affairs and in National Security Policy, those problems that did arise were principally procedural rather than substantive difficulties.

(e) How (potentially) serious are these school-departmental disagreements, and how might they be resolved?

- these problems are not unique to GW: they arise on many campuses with interdisciplinary programs that draw on different disciplines. Different campuses have adopted different arrangements to deal with the problem (illuminating examples include Princeton's Woodrow Wilson school, Russian Area Studies at Columbia, and recent news reports about Stanford's program related to national security affairs).

- Is there a systemic problem at GW, or was the Sino-Soviet appointment a very special situation not indicative of a systemic

difficulty?

- Is it reasonable to continue the present arrangements and see if they can be made to work, before engaging in wholesale changes in these arrangements?

3.2 Comparability of salary treatment (in terms of yearly increases) and teaching loads across schools.

In determining yearly salary increases, different deans will be overseeing the salary increases of individuals in the same department. Thus, for example, the salary increase decision for a faculty member in history whose budget line is assigned to ESIA will be overseen by a different dean than will the salary decision of a faculty member in history whose budget line is assigned to CCAS.

This division of responsibilities across deans can lead to salary increase comparability problems within a department for two reasons:

- First, there may be legitimate differences between the department chair's view of what comparability requires within the department, versus the ESIA dean's view of an individual's relative productivity within ESIA (that is, in comparison to all faculty budgeted to ESIA). These legitimate differences may arise for several reasons: (i) the groups of faculty being compared are fundamentally different (in one case a historian is being compared to other historians, in the other case a historian is being compared to a political scientist); (ii) the groups being compared show very different degrees of variation in quality; or (iii) the ESIA dean and the department chair have different views about what factors should be weighed most heavily in evaluating performance.
- Second, the amounts available for raises may differ because the department chair must spread his allocation across all CCAS-budgeted faculty members, while the ESIA dean must spread his allocation among all ESIA-budgeted faculty. The variation in quality of performance may be much higher in one of these groups than the other, leading to very different ability to differentially reward good performance.

Clearly, comparability problems can develop under the current division of responsibilities for determining salaries. There is a very strongly-held view on the part of at least one department that there has been insufficient communication between the ESIA dean and that

department in determining salary increases of department members in ESIA.

One possibility would be to make it established practice for the ESIA dean to obtain timely salary recommendations from the chair of the appropriate disciplinary department and, in the case of members of the Sino-Soviet Institute, the Director of that Institute.

Similar problems of comparability of treatment arise with respect to teaching loads and administrative responsibilities of those faculty budgeted to ESIA versus those budgeted to CCAS.

3.3 Differing school affiliations within a department leading to divisive departmental splits.

It was suggested above that the ESIA faculty and the non-ESIA faculty in a department might have profoundly different views of what constitutes the most appropriate disciplinary focus. The non-ESIA faculty's view of the kind of appointments or research activity that most enhances the department's reputation within the discipline may be at odds with ESIA's perceived need for individuals with interdisciplinary and regional research interests.

The general problem might be stated as follows: "membership in different schools may lead to different perceptions of priorities, and these different priorities can lead to divisive splits within departments". Such splits may be particularly evident and damaging in cases of appointment or promotion and tenure decisions. Several features of the problem are worth noting:

- As soon as a substantial number of department members are budgeted to more than one school, the problem can become significant. There is, in fact, ample evidence that the problem does exist in one of the departments contributing to ESIA.
- The competing demands on the department of differing programmatic responsibilities can have serious personnel implications affecting tenure and promotion decisions as well as appointments. When allocating personnel resources, which needs are to have priority: the undergraduate major in CCAS, GSAS M.A. and Ph.D programs, or ESIA undergraduate and M.A. programs in International Affairs? The very real difficulties of dealing with these competing programmatic demands are compounded when members of a department have competing school and budgetary loyalties.

- Alternative arrangements, such as two separate departments, are possible, but generate their own difficulties (such as duplicate appointments, course proliferation and overlap, and so forth).

3.4 Definition of appropriate responsibilities for faculty with memberships in more than one school.

- It seems clear that faculty will interpret their primary responsibility as residing with the school that has the faculty member's budget line.
- This seems to imply, contrary to the opinion sometimes expressed by the university administration, that a transfer of a faculty member's budget line to ESIA from another school is likely to result in a significant loss of that faculty member's services to the other school.
- An important issue is whether faculty budgeted to ESIA should be allowed to serve as chairs or members of the CCAS Personnel or Curriculum committees, or as chairs of CCAS departments. Analogous issues arise for CCAS-budgeted faculty serving on ESIA committees.
- Faculty appointed in different schools raises the possibility of course overlaps. Faculty in different schools with the same specialties may end up teaching very similar courses in their respective schools. Such overlapping courses may also raise issues of differing levels of difficulty in these courses.

4. If there is to be a process of "decommissioning" ESIA faculty not specializing in International Affairs, how can such a process be carried out in a manner consistent with the Faculty Code?...

- 4.1 The argument for decommissioning is that having a faculty all of whose members teach and do research in international affairs might make the school more effective in its international affairs mission.
- 4.2 The Faculty Code gives the Faculty the right to make recommendations on proposals concerning the creation, consolidation (etc) of schools. The Code further requires that the Faculty be informed sufficiently in advance of the action to allow for effective consultation. Decommissioning appears to fit under the category of a consolidation, implying that the Senate, as representative of the Faculty, has the right to make recommendations on this matter.

4.3 There is within parts of the ESIA faculty and perhaps within the administration some impulse to decommission those faculty whose research and teaching is not in international affairs. If a decommissioning were to be undertaken, how might it be done consistent with the Faculty Code?

4.4 Current ESIA Bylaws grant membership to those who were already members before the school was reorganized, and state criteria for elected membership. Decommissioning would seem to imply a Bylaws change that required that all faculty in ESIA met the criteria for elected membership. In addition, the teaching criterion might be altered to include only those who taught courses in international affairs or related fields.

If such a strategy were undertaken, would it be consistent with what the Faculty Code allows? Would its consistency depend on whether ESIA-budgeted or CCAS-budgeted faculty were involved? Would such a strategy require Faculty Senate consultation?

4.5 Whether or not there is decommissioning, there will still be two categories of faculty: those budgeted to ESIA and those not. This situation raises issues indicated in 3.4 above as to whether faculty not budgeted to ESIA should chair or serve on ESIA governance committees.

5. There must be protection of the rights of faculty who transfer to ESIA....

5.1 There has already been one case of an ESIA transfer who has transferred back.

5.2 When a consolidation takes place at the behest of the administration, and the consolidation involves negotiated transfers of faculty across schools, would it be desirable university policy to allow for a period of time (perhaps two years) during which a faculty member is allowed to transfer back to his prior school?

5.3 As part of the present reorganization, a few people presently on split budgeting arrangements will be transferred entirely to CCAS. The basic point here, of course, is that all of these positions are made and tenured in the arts and sciences departments. If a faculty member's research and teaching were to evolve away from international affairs, then the administrators at the time could no doubt work out an orderly realignment of responsibilities and primary school identification for that person. There might or might not have to be some compensating adjustment in the budget of ESIA.

5.4 It appears that some realignment of responsibilities and

school identification for such an individual can be worked out between deans. However, does the position remain with ESIA or return to CCAS?

- 5.5 It seems that both the definition of circumstances under which such a move would be the transferee's right, and the budgetary implications, deserve the Senate's attention.
6. When a transferee to ESIA retires or otherwise leaves the University where does the tenure-track slot and the associated budget reside? With ESIA or the school which was the original source of the position?
 - 6.1 The transferees will probably have continued to teach some courses which service CCAS and GSAS in addition to ESIA. If the slot goes to ESIA at the transferee's retirement, the other schools lose "part of a faculty member." It seems appropriate to find some way to take account of this loss at the time the transferee retires.
 - 6.2 Some of the discussion previously on Issue 5 may have bearing here, also.
7. How can we estimate, evaluate and monitor the effects of the ESIA faculty reconstitution on those schools who lose faculty as a result of this reconstitution?
 - 7.1 Former Dean of CCAS indicated a strong concern that resources in the College will be skewed over the longer run towards those departments that support ESIA, in part because positions transferred to ESIA, when they become vacant, are likely to go right back to the same social science departments. It seems probable that if the allocation of resources within the College continues to be heavily skewed in favor of the departments support ESIA, there will be a measurably negative impact on those departments that do not support ESIA, primarily the humanities and the sciences.
 - 7.2 Vice President French assured the faculties of CCAS and GSAS that the administration will not build up this ESIA at the price of weakening them. Two facts need to be noted here. (1) No one is being completely withdrawn from his or her present involvement with courses and students in the arts and sciences. Over a period of time, there of course will be a certain diminution of effort in this connection on the part of those whose line of primary accountability is shifted to ESIA. (2) On the other hand, the new positions which have been promised to ESIA over the next three years will also most likely be used to make appointments in the arts and sciences departments. No doubt those persons will be qualified for and involved in some teaching in CCAS and/or GSAS. They will represent net additions to the arts and sciences departments.

- 7.3 We cannot know in advance what new staffing may be required in arts and sciences as a result of this reorganization. The Deans involved were asked to monitor developments closely and to give the administration periodic assessments of the impact on the capacity of the affected departments to meet the needs of CCAS and GSAS.
 - 7.4 The administration appears to view the costs of transfers as minimal, a view not shared by Columbian College.
 - 7.5 It has been argued (by, for example, the CCAS Consultative Committee), that the Commission for the Year 2000 recommendations were predicated upon the availability of additional resources. If the recommendation to build up ESIA assumed additional resources, this implies that compensation for transfers is appropriate.
 - 7.6 If there are these potential dangers to CCAS (and therefore GSAS) from expansion of ESIA, this reinforces concerns about the arguably inadequate bases on which the administration has chosen the faculty size of ESIA. A more deliberate rate of expansion would minimize the deleterious effects on the arts faculties.
- 8. Consider whether and how to compensate those schools (departments) that incur significant losses because of the reconstitution.
 - 8.1 This is partially discussed in Issue 7 above.
 - 9. What is the administration's rationale for failing to invite transfers from the non-Arts-and-Sciences schools, and does this rationale appear to be appropriate?
 - 9.1 Little information was presented when this question was asked of the administrators involved in the reconstituting of ESIA. However, business and law have significant contributions in the international arena and may be impacted by this effort.

Raymond R. Fox, Chairman
 Robert Goldfarb
 William Johnson
 John Morgan
 Ralph Steinhardt

RRF:jjm

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
JANUARY 13, 1989
BY PROFESSOR LILIE F. ROBINSON, CHAIRMAN

On behalf of the Executive Committee, I would like to report on its activities subsequent to the November meeting of the Senate.

The Committee prepared the Resolution on Sabbatical Leave presented today.

It received an oral summary and the written report of the Special Committee on the Consolidation of SPIA. Both were presented by the Chairman of that Committee, Professor Fox.

The Executive Committee had requested consideration by the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom of Section E.2.b) Procedures for Implementation of Article X. of the Faculty Code. This section deals with mediation in grievance procedures. At issue was the question of whether mediation is required by the Code and the related question of the role of the Executive Committee in this process. Received from the PEAFC Committee was a thoughtful and succinct clarification on both questions and the conclusion that no changes in the Code were necessary. This response is being made a part of a developing documentation of the interpretation of the Executive Committee's role in the grievance process which we believe will be useful to the work of future Executive Committees. Additional and important commentary on function and procedures has also been provided by Professor Park and that also is being made a part of the record.

I would also like to report that in the case of the grievance in the Medical School and the nonconcurrence in the Arts and Sciences, both cases are now in process. The response of the respondent is now in hand in the grievance and meetings of the Executive Committee and the parties concerned have been scheduled for the nonconcurrence.

It gives me great pleasure to now take the opportunity to read and insert into the record a Resolution passed by the District of Columbia Board of Education, dated December 21, 1988. (Resolution is attached.)

Thank you.



The District of Columbia Board of Education

Resolution

The Members of The Board of Education

Boardmember Boyd Boardmember Bush Boardmember Corley

Boardmember Cropp Boardmember Eaton Boardmember Hall

Boardmember Harvey Boardmember Kinlow Boardmember Lockridge

Boardmember Washburn Boardmember Young

Present The Following Resolution:

WHEREAS, The George Washington University was founded in 1821 and is a world-renowned institution of higher learning located in the District of Columbia; and

WHEREAS, the President of The George Washington University, Stephen Joel Trachtenberg, became aware of the Incentive Scholarship Program and \$1 million pledge by the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) to the students of the Howard D. Woodson Senior High School located in Ward VII; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Trachtenberg was impressed by Fannie Mae's commitment and the educational incentives provided for the Woodson students; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Trachtenberg announced that every student from Woodson who graduates, applies to and is accepted by The George Washington University as a full-time undergraduate within the next ten years will receive a matching grant to their Fannie Mae Scholarship; and

The District of Columbia Board of Education

WHEREAS, Woodson graduates have the opportunity to receive a total award and college fund of \$8,000 from Fannie Mae and The George Washington University; and

WHEREAS, The George Washington University has promised to assist those Woodson graduates making appropriate academic progress and deemed in need of additional financial assistance by providing scholarships, loans, work-study and other financial packages. Now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the District of Columbia Board of Education express its gratitude to The George Washington University and its President, Steven Joel Trachtenberg, for the university's matching scholarship program and the hope provided to the future graduates of the Howard D. Woodson Senior High School.

This Resolution shall take effect immediately.

[Signature]
Sponsoring Board Member

I Hereby Certify that this Resolution is true and adopted as stated herein.

Resolution Number : 88-39

[Signature]
Executive Secretary, Board of Education

Board Meeting

Date: December 21, 1988

[Signature]
Superintendent, D.C. Public Schools



Records and Benefits Division
Office of Personnel Services

ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS FOR ACTIVE FACULTY/STAFF UPON ATTAINMENT
OF AGE 65
(as of 1-1-89)

Life Insurance

Employees may select basic coverage under Schedule 1 (the amount of Life Insurance will not exceed \$200,000) or Schedule 2 (the amount of Life Insurance will not exceed \$50,000). The amount of Life Insurance will be equal to a multiple of the employee's annual salary, according to the following table:

<u>Attained Age</u>	<u>Amount of Life Insurance as a Multiple of Your Annual Wage</u>	<u>Maximum Amount of Life Insurance Schedule 1</u>	<u>Maximum Amount of Life Insurance Schedule 2</u>
less than 70	1.00	\$200,000	\$50,000
70 but less than 75	.67	134,000	34,000
75 but less than 80	.45	90,000	23,000
80 but less than 85	.30	60,000	16,000
85 or over	.20	40,000	11,000

The amount of Life Insurance will be raised to the next multiple of \$1,000 if not already such a multiple. In no event will the amount of Life Insurance exceed the amount indicated in the table above, or be less than \$2,500. Optional coverage under Schedule 3 remains the same as coverage before age 65.

Retirement Plan

Employees' contributions through payroll reduction and University contributions will continue on behalf of any eligible staff/faculty member who continues in active employment at the University, regardless of age. Generally, retirement distributions of a minimum amount delayed beyond the April 1st following the year a person turns age 70 1/2 may be subject to a federal tax penalty.

Group Health Insurance/Major Medical

Benefits are the same for all active employees, regardless of age.

Total Disability

Coverage continues for all active employees regardless of age. If an employee becomes totally disabled when he or she is over 65 but less than 68 1/2, disability payments under the group plan end at age 70. If an employee becomes totally disabled when he or she is over age 68 1/2, disability payments will continue for one year.

Educational Benefits

Benefits are the same for all active employees regardless of age.

Social Security

Active employees may apply for Social Security benefits at age 62. Application should be made 3 months prior to the date benefits are to begin. Eligibility is based on numbers of quarters worked. Employees age 65-69 or older who continue to work while receiving Social Security benefits will be subject to an Earnings Limitation of \$8,880 in 1989. For every \$2 earned over the limit, Social Security benefits will be reduced by \$1. In 1990, the reductions will be \$1 for every \$3 over the limit, for those who are age 65-69. At age 70, there is no Earnings Limitation.

If an employee continues working beyond age 65, Social Security benefits will be increased by a percentage factor for the time that (s)he continues working and delays the start of benefits, but only up to age 70. Under no circumstances will payments be retroactive. See "Guide to Social Security" available in the Records and Benefits Office, for further information.

Medicare

The Medicare program has two parts: Part A is Hospital Insurance; Part B is Supplemental Medical Insurance, and beginning in 1990, Catastrophic Drug Insurance.

Medicare becomes available at the beginning of the month in which an individual becomes age 65, whether retired or still working. It also becomes available for individuals who have been receiving Social Security disability benefits for two years, or with chronic kidney disease.

Individuals over age 65 need to apply separately for Medicare.

Anyone eligible for more than six months of the year, for Part A benefits, whether enrolled or not, must pay a supplemental premium when filing his or her income tax return.

In 1989 this premium is \$22.50 for each \$150 of federal income tax liability up to a maximum of \$800 per person. This rate will increase over the next few years.

An individual eligible for Part A also becomes eligible for Part B, unless (s)he tells the Social Security Administration differently. If enrolled at the earliest opportunity, the monthly premium is \$31.90 in 1989. Late enrollees may have to pay a higher premium. Any period of time not covered by Part B while an individual was a member of an employer-sponsored group insurance plan will not count against him or her in determining a late penalty on the premium. Monthly premiums increase each January.

Medicare is supplemental to an employee's plan as long as (s)he is still working. Detailed information on eligibility requirements and coverage is available in the booklet "Guide to Social Security" available through the Records and Benefits Office.

In cases where there is any inconsistency or ambiguity between the terms of the individual certificates or group insurance contracts and those of this document, the terms of the contracts/certificates control unless it violates ERISA or other applicable law.

Records and Benefits Division
Office of Personnel Services

ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS UPON TERMINATION OR RETIREMENT
(as of 1-1-89)

Definition of Retirement

A regular faculty or staff member may retire in one of the following ways:

1. Normal retirement - retires at the end of the fiscal year in which the individual reaches age 65.
2. Mandatory retirement - tenured faculty must retire at the end of the fiscal year in which age 70 is attained. There is no mandatory retirement for non-tenured faculty or staff.
3. Early retirement - retires on or after the last day of the fiscal year in which the employee attains age 55 and completes a minimum of 20 years of Service Credit; or on or after the last day of the fiscal year in which the employee attains age 60 and completes a minimum of 10 years of Service Credit (subject to Board approval for faculty).
4. Partial retirement - Subject to programmatic needs, a full-time tenured faculty member who is retired with ten years of continuous full-time service, between the ages of 60 and 70, may continue on a half-time or two-thirds time regular active status until the mandatory retirement age.

Life Insurance

Terminated employees: Basic and optional coverage ends on the date of termination. The whole amount of coverage may be converted to an individual policy within 31 days of termination. The Accidental Death and Dismemberment Benefit ends upon termination and cannot be converted.

Retirees: The University pays the premium for basic coverage. The amount of coverage is reduced by 20% on the date of retirement and on each June 30th which falls on or next follows the anniversary of retirement. The basic coverage is reduced to \$2,500 on the June 30th which falls on or next follows the fourth anniversary or the 70th birthday, whichever is earlier. This coverage is continued throughout the employee's lifetime.

Optional coverage ends upon retirement, but may be converted

to an individual policy within 31 days, without evidence of insurability. The portion of basic coverage that is lost due to the first reduction may be converted to an individual policy within 31 days of the reduction without evidence of insurability. The Accidental Death and Dismemberment Benefit ends upon retirement and cannot be converted.

Retirement Plan

Employees' contributions through payroll reduction and University contributions end upon retirement or termination. The University will continue to make contributions on behalf of any eligible employee who continues in active employment at the University, regardless of age. Faculty members on partial retirement may continue to contribute to the plan and the University will continue its contribution based on the part-time salary.

Participants in the retirement plan will be sent information from TIAA/CREF prior to the elected retirement date. TIAA/CREF will provide estimates of the income under various retirement options. Generally, retirement distributions of a minimum amount delayed beyond the April 1st following the year a person turns age 70 1/2 may be subject to a federal tax penalty.

Group Health Insurance/Major Medical

Terminated employees: Coverage ends on the last day of the month in which the employee terminated. Under federal legislation, employees may elect to continue coverage under the group plan for up to 18 months or until (s)he 1) becomes eligible for coverage under another group plan; 2) becomes entitled to Medicare; 3) fails to pay premiums; or 4) the University no longer provides group health coverage for any of its employees. The employee pays the full premium and, at the end of the continuation coverage, can convert to an individual policy with the carrier (except Major Medical).

Retirees: If the retiree is a participant in one of the Group Health Insurance Plans at the time of retirement, (s)he may continue the same coverage by paying the total premium. The University no longer contributes its portion of the premium. If the retiree is a participant in the Group Major Medical Insurance Plan, the University pays the total premium for continued coverage in that plan. Major Medical Insurance benefits are changed as follows for retirees over age 65 and their spouses over age 65:

1. The initial benefit amount becomes the smaller of (a) \$100,000 or (b) the unused balance of the individual's maximum at age 65 or at retirement, if later.

2. There is no area of 100% reimbursement.
3. Reinstatement of benefits is limited to an automatic reinstatement on January 1 of each year of up to \$1,000 of benefits paid. There is no other reinstatement of benefits during retirement.
4. Covered Charges for transportation are limited to those incurred for local ambulance service.
5. Covered Charges for the treatment of mental or nervous disorders are limited to those incurred while confined to a hospital.
6. Charges by an Extended Care Facility are not covered.
7. Medicare benefits are carved-out. This means that benefits are reduced by the amount of Medicare benefits for which an individual is eligible, even if the individual has not applied for Medicare.

If an employee retires at age 65 or over and is eligible for coverage, these changes take place at the time of retirement. These changes take place for an insured spouse when he or she attains age 65.

Major Medical Coverage for retirees and their spouses will terminate upon the 70th birthday of each insured person. Dependent coverage will terminate upon loss of dependent status.

Retirees eligible for Medicare may apply for the Complement to Medicare rates (supplemental coverage which pays claims after Medicare) offered by many of the health plan options. This coverage is available at reduced monthly premiums.

Total Disability Coverage

Terminated/Retired employees: Coverage ends on the termination or retirement date.

Retired on disability: The last disability payment will be made on the first day of the month in which the earlier of these events occur:

1. The employee is no longer disabled.
2. The employee attains one of these age or time limits:
age 65, if the employee was 60 or less when Total Disability began

4 1/2 years of Total Disability payments, if the employee was over 60, but less than 65 when Total Disability began

age 70, if the employee was over 65, but less than 68 1/2 when Total Disability began

1 year of Total Disability payments, if the employee was over 68 1/2 when Total Disability began

If an active employee becomes disabled, and is receiving disability payments through the University's group Total Disability plan, payments will continue according to schedule even if the employee reaches retirement age while receiving disability benefits. Former employees may also qualify for disability benefits through Social Security. Refer to "Guide to Social Security" for more information.

Educational Benefits

Terminated employees: benefits cease at date of termination and if necessary, a pro rata financial adjustment is made.

Retirees:

Faculty and staff with less than ten years of service who retire at Normal retirement date or who retire on disability, retain full benefits for currently enrolled children.

Faculty who retire with more than ten years of service retain benefits for the individual, spouse, currently enrolled children and children who are dependent at the time of retirement and subsequently enroll at the University.

Staff who retire at Normal retirement age with more than ten years of service retain full benefits for currently enrolled children and for children who are dependent at the time of retirement and subsequently enroll at the University for undergraduate study. Staff member and spouse are no longer eligible for educational benefits.

Faculty with more than ten years of service who retire on Total Disability retain benefits for currently enrolled children and children dependent at the onset of the disability for the duration of the disability.

Social Security

Retirees age 62 and over may apply for Social Security benefits 90 days before the retirement date. Eligibility is based on number of quarters worked.

Active employees may apply for Social Security benefits at age 62. Eligibility is based on numbers of quarters worked. Employees

who continue to work while receiving Social Security benefits will be subject to an Earnings Limitation:

The Earnings Limitation for anyone receiving benefits who is under age 65 in 1989 is \$6,480. After that, it is subject to escalation.

The Earnings Limitation for anyone receiving benefits who is age 65-69 during 1989 is \$8,880. After that, the limit is subject to escalation.

After age 70, there is no limit.

For every \$2 earned over the limit, Social Security benefits will be reduced by \$1. In 1990, the reductions will be \$1 for every \$3 over the limit for those who are 65-69. There is a special rule based on monthly earnings which may be used if it gives an employee better results.

More information is available through your local Social Security office or in the booklet "Guide to Social Security" available through the Records and Benefits Office.

Medicare

The Medicare program has two parts: Part A is Hospital Insurance; Part B is Supplemental Medical Insurance, and beginning in 1990, Catastrophic Drug Insurance.

Medicare becomes available at the beginning of the month in which an individual becomes age 65, whether retired or still working. It also becomes available for individuals who have been receiving Social Security disability benefits for two years, or with chronic kidney disease.

Retirees on or before age 65: If an individual applies for Social Security, (s)he does not have to apply separately for Medicare. Once eligibility for Social Security is established, Part A coverage begins automatically at age 65. Spouses may also qualify for Medicare at age 65 based on the retiree's work record if the retiree is eligible for monthly benefits and not yet age 65.

Retirees after age 65: Individuals over age 65 need to apply separately for Medicare.

Anyone eligible, for more than six months of the year, for Part A benefits, whether enrolled or not, must pay a supplemental premium when filing his or her income tax return. In 1989 this premium is \$22.50 for each \$150 of federal income tax liability up to a maximum of \$800 per person. This rate will increase over the next few years.

An individual eligible for Part A also becomes eligible for Part B unless (s)he tells the Social Security Administration differently. If enrolled at the earliest opportunity, the monthly premium is \$31.90 in 1989. Late enrollees may have to pay a higher premium. Any period of time not covered by Part B while an individual was a member of an employer-sponsored group insurance plan will not count against him or her in determining a late penalty on the premium. Monthly premiums increase each January.

Medicare is supplemental to an employee's plan as long as (s)he is still working. Detailed information on eligibility requirements and coverage for Medicare Parts A and B is provided in the booklet "Guide to Social Security" available through the Records and Benefits Office.

In cases where there is any inconsistency or ambiguity between the terms of the individual certificates or group insurance contracts and those of this document, the terms of the contracts/certificates control unless it violates ERISA or other applicable law.

Records and Benefits Division
Office of Personnel Services

SURVIVOR BENEFITS UPON DEATH OF FACULTY MEMBER, STAFF MEMBER, OR
RETIREE
(as of 1-1-89)

ACTIVE FACULTY MEMBER/STAFF MEMBER

Group Health Insurance

Spouse and eligible dependents may continue at the group rates, unless spouse joins another group plan.

Major Medical

Coverage will continue for a spouse and eligible dependents for one year. Under federal legislation, spouse and dependents may elect to continue coverage under the Group Plan for up to two more years, unless the spouse or dependents become covered under another group plan, or become entitled to Medicare, fail to pay the premium, or the University no longer provides group health coverage to its employees. For information regarding cost of coverage, consult a Benefits Specialist.

Group Total Disability Plan

ceases upon death of faculty member/staff member

Group Life Insurance

paid to named beneficiary/beneficiaries

Educational Benefits

The full benefit will continue for currently enrolled children. Benefits will also be provided for children dependent at the time of the parent's death if they subsequently enroll at the University.

Retirement Plan

Full accumulated faculty/staff/GWU contributed amount is payable to named beneficiary/beneficiaries under several options. Federal law requires that at least 50% be payable to the spouse

unless the spouse waives the benefit prior to faculty/staff member's death.

Death Gratuity

One month's base salary is paid to the estate of the deceased regular faculty or staff member.

Social Security

At the time of death, a one-time lump-sum amount is payable to a surviving spouse who is living with the individual at the time of death. Dependents may receive monthly survivor benefits. To receive the lump-sum or monthly benefits, the employee must be either currently insured (provides eligibility for some benefits, but not all) or fully insured.

Benefits vary, depending on factors such as age, marital/dependent status, earnings history and number of quarters worked. Please see "Guide to Social Security" in the Records and Benefits Office for further information.

RETIRED FACULTY MEMBER/STAFF MEMBER

Group Health Insurance

Spouse and eligible dependents may continue with the group unless spouse joins another group plan.

Major Medical

Coverage will continue for a spouse and eligible dependents for one year. Under federal legislation, spouse and dependents may elect to continue coverage under the Group Plan for up to two more years, unless the spouse or dependents become covered under another group plan, or become entitled to Medicare, fail to pay the premium, or the University no longer provides group health coverage to its employees. For information regarding cost of coverage, consult a Benefits Specialist.

Group Total Disability Plan

ceases upon death of faculty member/staff member

Group Life Insurance

proceeds are paid to named beneficiary/beneficiaries

Retirement

income continues to spouse or beneficiaries dependent upon prior selection by retiree

Educational Benefits

Faculty and staff with less than ten years of service who retired at Normal retirement date or who retired on disability: benefits will continue for children currently enrolled at the time of the parent's death.

Faculty who retired with more than ten years of service: benefits will continue for the spouse and currently enrolled children and children who were dependents at the time of retirement and subsequently enroll at the University.

Staff who retired at Normal retirement age with more than ten years of service: benefits will continue for currently enrolled children and for children who were dependents at the time of retirement and subsequently enroll at the University for undergraduate study.

Faculty with more than ten years of service who retired on Total Disability: benefits will continue for currently enrolled children and children dependent at the onset of the disability for the duration of the disability.

Social Security

See information under "Active Faculty Member/Staff Member"

In cases where there is any inconsistency or ambiguity between the terms of the individual certificates or group insurance contracts and those of this document, the terms of the contracts/certificates control unless it violates ERISA or other applicable law.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

The Faculty Senate

December 22, 1988

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, January 13, 1989, at
2:10 p.m., in Lisner Hall 603.

AGENDA

1. Call to order
2. Short recess for the purpose of having a formal group photograph taken of the Faculty Senate (1988-89 Session)
3. Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of November 11, 1988
4. Resolutions:
 - (a) A RESOLUTION CONCERNING FACULTY SUPPORT OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES (88/3); Professor Christopher Deering, Chairman, Committee on University Libraries (Resolution 88/3 is attached.)
 - (b) A RESOLUTION CONCERNING SABBATICAL LEAVE POLICY (88/4); Professor Lilien F. Robinson, Chairman, Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate (Resolution 88/4 is attached.)
5. Introduction of Resolutions
6. Final Report of the Special Committee on Consolidation of SPIA; Professor Raymond R. Fox, Chairman
7. General Business:
 - (a) Nomination for election of Professor Marvin S. Katzman as Acting Co-Chairperson of the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students
 - (b) Nomination for election of Professor Robert N. Ganz to the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students as replacement for Professor Robbins who will be on sabbatical leave Spring 1989
 - (c) Nomination for election of Professor Georgio V. Borgiotti to the Honors and Academic Convocations Committee
 - (d) Report of the Executive Committee: Professor Lilien F. Robinson, Chairman
8. Brief statements
9. Adjournment



J. Matthew Gaglione
Secretary

A RESOLUTION CONCERNING FACULTY SUPPORT OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES (88/3)

WHEREAS, budget cuts, combined with skyrocketing publishing costs, have forced the University Libraries to make significant, even ruinous cuts, in acquisitions during the past two years; and

WHEREAS, faculty members from the several schools in the University are among the principal beneficiaries of strong University Libraries; NOW, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That the Faculty Senate urge all members of the faculty of The George Washington University to make a special contribution to the Annual Fund this year--either an additional pledge or a portion of a new pledge--and to designate it for "acquisitions" by one or all of the University Libraries.

Libraries Committee
December 7, 1988

A RESOLUTION CONCERNING SABBATICAL LEAVE POLICY (88/4)

- WHEREAS, a major goal of the University has been to improve and increase research productivity; and
- WHEREAS, the attainment of that goal has been severely limited by inadequate resources and release time; and
- WHEREAS, sabbatical leave represents an appropriate vehicle for encouragement of research activity; and
- WHEREAS, financial constraints have prevented faculty from selecting the full year sabbatical leave option; and
- WHEREAS, the Administration has indicated its support of greater utilization of that option by its willingness to increase the University's contribution from 50% to 60% for the full year sabbatical leave; NOW, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That, effective for sabbatical leaves in 1989-90 and thereafter, faculty will be able to select a two-semester leave term with a payment of 60% of their salary; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED

That Section VI.B., Paragraph 4, lines 1-3 (p.13) of the Faculty Code be changed to read:

"The University shall pay members of the Faculty while on sabbatical leave 60% of their salary for two semesters or all of their salary for one semester.

(addition indicated by underlining)

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
December 16, 1988

FACULTY SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

January, 1989

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

TO: Members of the University Faculty Assembly

FROM: Lilien F. Robinson, Chairman, Faculty Senate Executive
Committee *Lilien F. Robinson*

SUBJECT: Call for Nominees for Election to Faculty Senate
Standing Committees, 1989-90 Session

In April, the newly-elected and incumbent Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate will meet jointly "to nominate the members and chairmen of the standing committees and special committees" of the Faculty Senate for the year 1989-90.

I urge all colleagues seriously to consider volunteering their service to one of the following Senate Committees during the forthcoming year. Please keep in mind that in the interest of "continuity" in committee membership, the Senate amended its Bylaws to read: "...elected members should consider it an obligation to stand for re-election to the same committee at least once." If you wish to be elected or re-elected to a Senate Committee, this form must be returned to the FACULTY SENATE OFFICE, RICE HALL, #305, NO LATER THAN MARCH 31, 1989.

Administrative Matters	Libraries
as They Affect the Faculty	Physical Facilities
Appointment, Salary and Promotion	Professional Ethics and Academic
Policies (including Fringe Benefits)	Freedom
Athletics	Research
Educational and Admissions Policy	Student Financial Aid
Fiscal Planning and Budgeting	University Development and
Dispute Resolution Committee (3-yr term)	Resources
Honors and Academic Convocations	University and Urban Affairs

Name _____ Department _____ Rank _____

Currently serving on the Senate Committee on: _____

Do you wish to be re-elected to this Committee? ☐ Yes ☐ No

I should like to serve on a Senate Committee in the following order of preference:

(1st Choice) _____
(2nd Choice) _____
(3rd Choice) _____

I will be available for committee work during the regular academic year _____

I will also be available for committee work during at least one of the summer sessions _____

I prefer not to serve during 1989-90 _____

ADMINISTRATIVE STANDING COMMITTEES

January, 1989

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

TO: Members of the University Faculty Assembly

FROM: Lilien F. Robinson, Chairman, Executive Committee of
the Faculty Senate *L. F. Robinson*

SUBJECT: Appointments to Administrative Standing and Special
Committees for the Year 1989-90

At its April and May meetings the Faculty Senate will recommend faculty for presidential appointment to membership on certain Administrative Standing Committees listed below. When the Executive Committee meets in March, it will draw up a list of faculty nominees for approval by the Senate.

If you are interested in volunteering your services--and I urge you to give the matter serious consideration--please indicate your preference and return this form to: FACULTY SENATE OFFICE, RICE HALL, #305, NO LATER THAN MARCH 14, 1989.

Advisory Committee for the Charles E. Smith Center for Physical Education and Athletics	<u>GW Forum</u>
Committee on Campus Security	Joint Committee of Faculty and Students
Committee on the Judicial System	Marvin Center Governing Board
Committee on Sponsored Research	Marvin Center Program Board
Committee on Student Publications	Panel for Student Grievance
Committee on University Bookstore	Review Committees
Committee on University Parking	University Hearing Board

Name _____ Department _____ Rank _____

Currently serving on the Administrative Committee on: _____

Do you wish to be re-elected to this Committee ☐ Yes ☐ No

I should like to serve on an Administrative Committee within the time limitation noted below. I prefer service on one of the following committees:

(1st Choice) _____
(2nd Choice) _____
(3rd Choice) _____

I will be available for committee work during the regular academic year _____

I will also be available for committee work during at least one of the summer sessions _____

I prefer not to serve during 1989-90 _____